REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-2 and 5-10 are pending in the application, of which claims 1, 2, and 10 are amended. Claims 11-13 and 15-16 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

The Rejections

Claims 1, 5-11 and 15-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,377,825 to Kennedy et al. (hereinafter, "Kennedy") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,509,048 to Meidan et al. (hereinafter, "Meidan") in further view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0066115 to Wendelrup (hereinafter, "Wendelrup") and in further view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0068605 to Stanley (hereinafter, "Stanley").

Claims 2 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kennedy in view of Meidan in further view of Wendelrup in further view of Stanley and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,489,934 to Klausner (hereinafter, "Klausner").

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kennedy in view of Meidan in further view of Wendelrup in further view of Stanley and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,115,618 to Lebby et al. (hereinafter, "Lebby").

Arguments

Independent claim 1 has been amended and, as amended, recites an apparatus for displaying information from a portable communications device, having a data output port and a scrollable display, on a remote projection display device having a data input port, the apparatus comprising (emphasis added):

> a first data port associated with a cradle for receiving the portable communications device, the first data port adapted to be coupled to the data output port of the portable communications device, the first data port for receiving remote data from the portable communications device, the remote data including remote audio data and remote visual data; and
>
> a second data port that is adapted to be coupled to the data input port of the remote projection display device, the second data port for automatically, upon placement of the portable communications device into the cradle, providing to the remote projection display device a representation of the remote visual data received from the portable communications device;
>
> wherein the apparatus is configured to receive scrolling commands from a scroll controller, the scroll controller being adapted to cause the remote projection display device to provide a scrolling display of information that corresponds to the scrollable display of the portable communications device;
>
> wherein the scroll controller comprises a control device that is integrated into an automobile steering wheel and is adapted to be electrically coupled to the remote projection display device;
>
> wherein the apparatus is also configured to receive commands from a display controller, the display controller being adapted to cause the remote projection display device to turn on and off the displayed information;
>
> wherein the display controller also comprises a control device that is integrated into the automobile steering wheel and is adapted to be electrically connected to the remote projection display device;

wherein the cradle includes a serial port for receiving the remote audio data, a speaker for outputting the remote audio data, and a microphone for receiving audio data that is to be sent back through the portable communications device; and

wherein the cradle is also adapted to couple to a hands-free kit, such that when the cradle couples to the hands-free kit the hands-free kit outputs the remote audio data and receives the audio data that is to be sent back through the portable communications device.

In making out a rejection of claim 1 before its amendment, the Office submits that the claim is obvious in view of the combination of Kennedy, Meidan, Wendelrup, and Stanley. (*Office Action of 10/31/2006*, p. 2-5). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection. Nevertheless, Applicant has amended claim 1 for the sole purpose of furthering prosecution and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejections.

As amended, claim 1 recites an apparatus comprising "a first data port associated with a cradle...wherein the cradle includes a serial port for receiving the remote audio data, a speaker for outputting the remote audio data, and a microphone for receiving audio data that is to be sent back through the portable communications device; and wherein the cradle is also adapted to couple to a hands-free kit, such that when the cradle couples to the hands-free kit the hands-free kit outputs the remote audio data and receives the audio data that is to be sent back through the portable communications device". Applicant notes that the amendment is fully supported in the specification as filed. For example, Applicant directs the Office's attention to page 6, lines 13-22 and page 7, lines 8-11. Applicant respectfully submits that none of the cited references have been shown to teach or suggest a cradle that "includes a serial port for receiving the remote

audio data, a speaker for outputting the remote audio data, and a microphone for receiving audio data", while at the same time being "adapted to couple to a hands-free kit", as recited in Applicant's claim.

For example, Kennedy describes a hands-free wireless communication apparatus for use in a vehicle. Kennedy is not cited to teach an apparatus that is so configured, nor does Kennedy teach such an apparatus. Meidan, meanwhile, describes a mobile radiotelephone which facilitates usage thereof by a user while also operating a vehicle. Again, Meidan is not cited for the newly-added cradle capabilities, nor does Meidan teach such capabilities. Wendelrup, which teaches a type of portable communications device, is similarly not cited for nor does it teach such a cradle. Finally, Stanley describes a mechanical user-interface for a wireless communications device that enables a motor-vehicle operator to operate the communications device while keeping both hands on the steering wheel. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that Stanley is not cited for nor does Stanley teach the newly-added subject matter recited in Applicant's claim.

For at least this reason, Applicant submits that the Kennedy-Meidan-Wendelrup-Stanley combination has not been shown to support a §103 rejection of claim 1. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 2 and 5-9 depend from claim 1 and, by virtue of this dependency, the above comments directed to claim 1 apply equally to these claims. Moreover, these claims recite features that, when taken together with those of claim 1, define devices not taught or suggested by the cited references.

Independent claim 10 recites an apparatus for hands-free communication using a portable communications device, the apparatus adapted to receive remote data from the portable communications device via a wireless telecommunications link, the portable communications device having an externally accessible data output port and the remote data including remote audio data and remote visual data, the apparatus comprising:

> a housing that is adapted to receive the portable communications device;
>
> a sensor for detecting placement of the portable communications device into the housing;
>
> a first interface for coupling the data output port of the portable communications device to the housing;
>
> a second interface for coupling the housing to a data input port of a remote projection display device;
>
> a processor for receiving the remote data from the portable communications device, converting the received remote visual data to a format displayable by a remote projection display device, and forwarding the converted remote visual data to the remote projection display device via the second interface for automatic display upon detection of placement of the portable communications device into the housing;
>
> a serial port for receiving the remote audio data;
>
> a speaker for outputting the remote audio data; and
>
> a microphone for receiving audio data that is to be sent back through the portable communications device;
>
> wherein the apparatus is adapted to couple to a hands-free kit, such that when the apparatus couples to the hands-free kit the hands-free kit outputs the remote audio data and receives the audio data that is to be sent back through the portable communications device;

wherein the portable communications device includes a scrolling capability, and the processor includes a scroll controller that receives scrolling commands from a remote scroll control device that is adapted to be integrated into an automobile steering wheel and adapted to cause the remote projection display device to provide a scrolling display of the converted remote visual data based on the scrolling commands;

wherein the processor is configured to receive commands from a remote toggle controller, the remote toggle controller being adapted to cause the remote projection display device to toggle the display of the remote visual data between on and off states in response to actuation of the remote toggle controller;

wherein the second interface is a wireless interface that is adapted to couple the housing to a corresponding wireless interface of the remote projection display;

wherein the processor includes a data translator for the converting of the received remote visual data;

wherein the first interface is a serial port connector and the second interface is a serial port connector; and

wherein a connection between the first interface and the data output port of the portable communications device is achieved upon receipt of the portable communications device.

In making out a rejection of claim 10 before its amendment, the Office submits that the claim is obvious in view of the combination of Kennedy, Meidan, Wendelrup and Stanley. (*Office Action of 10/31/2006*, p. 9-12). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection. Nevertheless, Applicant has amended claim 10 for the sole purpose of furthering prosecution and without conceding the propriety of the Office's rejections.

Specifically, claim 10 has been amended to recite features similar to those added to independent claim 1. Therefore, these amendments are at least supported by the same portions of Applicant's specification discussed above in regards to

claim 1. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that none of the cited references have been shown to teach or suggest these newly-added features, as discussed above in regards to claim 1. Finally, Applicant notes that claim 10 has also been amended to include the subject matter of now-cancelled claims 12-13 and 15-16, and that a claim reciting these elements in combination has not been rejected.

For at least these reasons, Applicant therefore submits that the Kennedy-Meidan-Wendelrup-Stanley combination has not been shown to support a § 103 rejection of claim 10. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-2 and 5-10, and favorable action on the subject application. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned agent to resolve the issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 2007/01/29

By: _____

Robert G. Hartman
Lee & Hayes, pllc
Reg. No. 58,970
(509) 324-9256 ext. 265